

Remarks

Claims 1-30 are pending in the application. Claims 1-21 are indicated as being allowable. The specification has been amended. Reconsideration and re-examination of the application is respectfully requested for the reasons set forth herein.

1. The Examiner has objected to the Abstract, because the species shown in Figure 3 was not described in the Abstract. The Abstract has been amended to include the species shown in Figure 3. Some language in the Abstract has been deleted to remain within the 150 word limit that is required by the United States Patent and Trademark Office. In view of this amendment, removal of the objection to the Abstract is respectfully requested.
2. The Examiner stated that the document listed as AX in the information disclosure statement was not submitted with the information disclosure statement dated September 12, 2003. A copy of the document listed as AX is submitted herewith.
3. The Examiner has objected to the specification, because the specification does not discuss the purpose and/or effect on performance of the slit 55 and the elastic plate portion 54. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner in that the purpose and/or effect on performance of the slit 55 and the elastic plate portion 54 is discussed at least in part on page 17, line 14 through page 18, line 3. Removal of the objection to the specification therefore is respectfully requested.

The specification has also been amended to correct several typographical and grammatical errors. No new matter has been added. Approval of these amendments is respectfully requested.

4. The Examiner has rejected claims 22-30 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). With regard to claim 22, the Examiner stated that claim 22 was unpatentable over McHugh et al., McHugh et al. in view of Lynch, and McHugh et al. in view of White.

With regard to the rejection of claim 22 over McHugh et al., McHugh et al. does not teach or suggest all of the elements of claim 22. Claim 22 requires a base plate and a resilient contact extending from an upper end of the base plate having an elongated slit substantially in a center of the resilient contact with respect to a direction of width. The Examiner identifies the main body 101 of the contact 100 in McHugh et al. as the resilient contact having the elongated slit of the claimed invention. As discussed in column 4, line 66 through column 5, line 11 in McHugh et al., the main body 101 is not a resilient contact, but is a base plate with barbs 102 for mounting the contact 100. McHugh et al. therefore does not teach or suggest a base plate and a resilient contact extending from an upper end of the base plate having an elongated slit, as required by the claimed invention. Because McHugh et al. does not teach or suggest all of the elements of claim 22, the Examiner has failed to set forth a prima facie case of obviousness. Removal of the rejection of claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectfully requested.

With regard to the rejection of claim 22 over McHugh et al. in view of Lynch and McHugh et al. in view of White, the combination of McHugh et al. in view of Lynch and McHugh et al. in view of White does not teach or suggest all of the elements of claim 22. As previously discussed, McHugh et al. does not teach all of the elements of claim 22, except for a

resilient contact having a slit. Because McHugh et al. does not teach all of the elements of claim 22, the combination of McHugh et al. in view of Lynch and McHugh et al. in view of White does not teach or suggest all of the elements of claim 22. Because the Examiner has failed to set forth a prima facie case of obviousness, removal of the rejection of claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Claims 23-30 depend from independent claim 22. As previously discussed, McHugh et al., McHugh et al. in view of Lynch, and McHugh et al. in view of White do not teach or suggest all of the elements of claim 22. Because the cited references fail to teach or suggest all of the elements of claim 22, the cited references also fail to teach or suggest all of the elements of claims 23-30. Because the Examiner has failed to set forth a prima facie case of obviousness, removal of the rejection of claims 23-30 is respectfully requested.

In view of the amendments and arguments presented herein, the application is considered to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and passage to issue is respectfully requested.

Please charge any additional fees associated with this application to Deposit Order Account No. 501581.

Respectfully submitted,
Shirai et al., Applicants



Jennifer Mae Slonaker
Registration No. 50568
Attorney for Applicants
Phone: 717.399.1535
Facsimile: 717.291.4660